UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,261	07/11/2007	Lars Michael Larsen	LARSEN 5	6440
1444 Browdy and Ne	7590 02/15/201 simark, PLLC	1	EXAM	IINER
1625 K Street, I Suite 1100		FAY, ZOHREH A		
Washington, DO	C 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/15/2011	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/593,261	LARSEN, LARS	LARSEN, LARS MICHAEL	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ZOHREH A. FAY	1627		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence a	ddress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this (BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ Th 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal ma	•	e merits is	
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 59-61,63-79 and 108-117 is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 59-61,63-79 and 108-117 is/are rejection claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and application Papers	awn from consideration.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a continuous applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Replacement drawing sheet(s).	ecepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeya ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 C	, ,	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document of:  2. Certified copies of the priority document of:  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document of the priority document of the certified copies of the	nts have been received.  nts have been received in a lority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this Nationa	l Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	_ Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/29/2010	5)  Notice of Other:	Informal Patent Application		

Claims 59-61, 79 and 108-118 have been presented for examination.

The amendments and remarks filed on November 30, 2010 have been received and entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 59-61, 79 and 108-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campochiaro et al. (US 5,824,685) in view of Oikawa et al. (submitted by the applicant).

Campochiaro et al. teach the use of the claimed retinoids, such as, Formula V for the treating proliferative retinopathy. See the abstract, column 3, lines 49-64, column 4, lines 30-65, claims 1-12 and table 3. Campochiaro et al. differs from the claimed invention in using the compounds for the treatment of non-proliferative diabetic retinopathy. Oikawa et al. teach the use of the compounds within the scope of formula

Art Unit: 1627

I for the treatment of diabetic retinopathy. The above reference makes clear that the genus of compounds of Formula V, have been previously used for the treatment of diabetic retinopathy. See the entire document. It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art to use compound of formula V for the treatment of diabetic retinopathy, motivated by the teachings of Oikawa et al., which teach the genus of compound V has been previously used for the treatment of diabetic retinopathy. It would have been further obvious to use the compounds of Campochiaro et al. for the treatment of diabetic retinopathy, considering that diabetic retinopathy is an angiogenic proliferative disease, and the use of the claimed compounds for the treatment of proliferative retinopathy is expected to be useful for the treatment of diabetic retinopathy. Applicant has presented no evidence to establish the unexpected or unobvious nature of the claimed invention, and as such, claims 59-61, 79 and 108-115 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

Applicant's arguments and remarks have been carefully considered, but are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant in his remarks argues that Oikawa relates to the use of retinoids for the treatment of proliferative diabetic retinopathy and not non-proliferative diabetic proliferative. It is the examiner's position that proliferative diabetic retinopathy is the advanced stage of non-proliferative diabetic retinopathy.. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art to use a compound being used for the treatment of proliferative retinopathy and use it for the treatment of non-proliferative diabetic retinopathy. Applicant's arguments regarding the Campochiaro have been noted. Campochiaro is used to show that the claimed compounds are

retinoid agonists being used for the treatment of retinal disorders. To substitute the claimed retinoid agonists for the structurally similar retinoid agonists of Oikawa and use them for the treatment of diabetic retinopathy would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZOHREH A. FAY whose telephone number is (571)272-0573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/593,261 Page 5

Art Unit: 1627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ZF /Zohreh A Fay/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1627